

CAMAF Scientific Production Framework

Author's Manual

Version 1.0.2

Alex Moura

ORCID: 0009-0009-4427-0540

alex.moura@structuristics.org

May 31, 2026

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.20073205](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20073205)

Produced under: CAMAF Scientific Production Methodology
(DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20073205)

Version policy: Patch = form only; Minor = new content, no architectural change;
Major = substantial restructuring.

Citation: Required per page only when a localised claim is attributed to a specific location. Work as a whole when existence matters. Prohibited as bibliographic ornament.

Language: English as primary (this document). Portuguese as secondary (subsequent version). In case of conceptual conflict, this English version prevails.

Abstract

This manual specifies the production standards that apply to all documents claiming compliance with the CAMAF Scientific Production Methodology. It does not describe a style guide. It describes the epistemic conditions under which a document earns the right to be treated as a contribution to knowledge, independently of the institutional affiliation of its author, the language in which it was written, the platform on which it was published, or the method by which it was produced.

The manual is organised into seven parts. Part I establishes the foundational principles and the manifesto from which the standards derive. Parts II to IV specify the standards, integrated with explicit critiques of conventional practices that they replace or restructure. Part V provides a complete guide to algorithmic prose. Part VI specifies the public audit protocol and the living registry of critical responses. Part VII provides master checklists by document type and production phase.

Fifteen standards are defined. Standards 1 through 8 are incorporated from the CAMAF Operational Standard v1.0.1 with expansion. Standards 9 through 15 are introduced in this manual.

The primary claim of this document: the credibility of a knowledge claim is a property of the claim and the reasoning that supports it, not a property of the person, institution, or system that produced it. Every standard in this manual derives from this claim.

0 Contents

Version Changelog	7
CAMAF Standards Compliance Declaration	7
Opening Note	8
I Foundations and Manifesto	9
1 The Origin of the Framework	9
2 The Manifesto	10
2.1 What this manual asserts	10
2.2 What this manual does not assert	11
3 The Derivation Chain	12
II The Standards	12
Preface to Part II	12
4 Standard 1: Criteria Declaration	13
4.1 Rationale	13
4.2 Critique of conventional practice: claims as conclusions	13
5 Standard 2: Argument Structure	13
5.1 Rationale	14
5.2 Critique of conventional practice: argument by expertise	14
6 Standard 3: Method Declaration	14
6.1 Rationale	14
6.2 Critique of conventional practice: IMRAD as universal structure	15
7 Standard 4: Domain of Application	15
7.1 Rationale	15
7.2 Critique of conventional practice: implicit universalisation	15

8	Standard 5: Falsification Conditions	16
8.1	Rationale	16
8.2	Critique of conventional practice: post-hoc prediction	16
9	Standard 6: Epistemic Category and Support Level Declaration	16
9.1	The Five Support Levels	17
9.2	Rationale	17
9.3	Critique of conventional practice: citation as category validation	17
10	Standard 7: Version and Amendment Record	18
10.1	Rationale	18
10.2	Critique of conventional practice: the published paper as static object	18
11	Standard 8: Non-Assertion Declaration	19
11.1	Rationale	19
11.2	Critique of conventional practice: implicit scope	19
12	Standard 9: Epistemic Autonomy	19
12.1	Rationale	20
12.2	Critique of conventional practice: affiliation as credibility proxy	20
13	Standard 10: Language	20
13.1	Rationale	20
13.2	Critique of conventional practice: English hegemony	21
14	Standard 11: Author Contributions	21
14.1	Rationale	21
14.2	Critique of conventional practice: authorship as negotiation	22
15	Standard 12: Conflict of Interests	22
15.1	Rationale	22
15.2	Critique of conventional practice: financial disclosure as complete disclosure	23
16	Standard 13: Pre-registration	23
16.1	Rationale	24
16.2	Critique of conventional practice: post-hoc prediction	24
17	Standard 14: Data, Protocols, and Temporal Precedence	24

17.1 Rationale	25
17.2 Critique of conventional practice: data available on request	26
18 Standard 15: Retraction and Correction	26
18.1 Rationale	27
18.2 Critique of conventional practice: retraction as scandal	27
III Document Types	27
Preface to Part III	27
19 New Field Proposal	28
20 Empirical Paper	28
21 Systematic Review	29
22 Framework Convergence Analysis	29
23 Comment and Response	29
24 Public Scientific Communication	29
IV Algorithmic Prose	30
25 Definition	30
26 Why the name does not mean what it seems	31
27 Joint motivations	31
28 How to write algorithmic prose	31
29 How to audit algorithmic prose	32
30 Ten examples by domain	32
30.1 Example 1: Everyday life	32
30.2 Example 2: Mathematics	32
30.3 Example 3: Physics	33

30.4 Example 4: Biology	33
30.5 Example 5: Law	33
30.6 Example 6: Economics	34
30.7 Example 7: Education	34
30.8 Example 8: Information Technology	35
30.9 Example 9: Qualitative Research	35
30.10 Example 10: Social Systems	35
 V CAMAF Standards: CS1, CS2, CS3, CSx	 36
Preface	36
Reconciliation Note: The Horizon and the Ladder	36
31 CS1: Declarative Transparency	37
32 CS2: Structural Transparency	38
33 CS3: Full Accountability	39
34 CSx: Declared Extension	39
35 Unifying Principle	40
 VI Public Audit and Living Registry	 40
36 The Audit as Constitutive Component	40
37 Self-Declaration	41
38 The Living Registry	41
39 Formal Critique: Template	41
40 Response Protocol	42
 VII Master Checklist	 42
41 Checklist by Standard	42

42 Checklist by Production Phase	44
42.1 Before writing	44
42.2 During writing	44
42.3 Before publication	44
42.4 After publication	44
 Appendix A: IMRAD/CAMAF Correspondence Map	 45
 Appendix A: IMRAD/CAMAF Map	 45
Version Notes	45
Methodological Note	46
Author Contributions	47
Conflict of Interests	47
Conditions for Correction and Retraction	48
Acknowledgments	48
 Appendix B: Recommended Section Architecture v1.4	 48
 Appendix B: Section Architecture v1.4	 48
Complete Version History	50
References	51
Related Works	52

Language declaration. The primary production language of this manual is **Portuguese**. This is the **English** version (secondary language). In case of conceptual conflict between this version and the Portuguese version, the Portuguese version prevails. An Italian version is available as a third language with AI use declaration.

0 Version Changelog

Version	Date	Changes
1.0.2	2026-05-31	Clarity, spelling, and internal consistency revision. No claim altered.

The complete version history is before the references, in descending order, for audit purposes.

0 CAMAF Standards Compliance Declaration

CAMAF Standards Compliance Declaration — Author's Manual v1.0.2 (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20073205).

CS1	Declarative Transparency	Standards 1, 2, 7, 8. Minimum floor for knowledge claim status.
CS2	Structural Transparency	CS1 + Standards 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10.
	this document	← Declares domain and falsification conditions. Algorithmic prose required.
CS3	Full Accountability	CS2 + Standards 11–15. Living registry, open data, retraction protocol.
CSx	Declared Extension	Beyond CS3, under declared derivation from CS3.

Standards 1 through 10 are satisfied at the document level. Standard 6 is additionally satisfied at the claim level via epistemic categories declared in the Methodological Note.

Why this document declares CS2 and not CS3. CS3 requires Standards 11–15 as active obligations beyond initial publication. This document partially satisfies these standards: Standard 11 (Author Contributions) and Standard 12 (Conflict of Interests) are declared in the corresponding sections at the end of this document; Standard 13 (Pre-registration) is declared N/A with justification; Standard 15 (Retraction) is declared with conditions. The primary blocker for CS3 is Standard 14: the simultaneous dual deposit at OSF as mirror repository has not been executed in this version. A CS3 declaration requires that the deposit has already occurred, not merely that it is planned. When the OSF deposit is executed, this document may advance to CS3 in version 1.1.0, which will be a MINOR change: new content without breaking existing claims.

0 Opening Note

This manual does not replace Wazlawick, Zobel, the APA, the ABNT, or any other scientific methodology guide. Anyone who wants to learn to conduct empirical research, structure experiments, write well in academic English, and navigate the conventional publishing system should read those books. They do so with competence and depth that this document does not intend to replicate.

What this manual does is different.

Existing methodology guides answer the question: how to produce documents that will be accepted by the conventional academic system. The CAMAF Author's Manual answers a different question: what are the minimum conditions for a document to be a knowledge document, independently of who produced it, in what institution, in what language, by what method, and on what platform it was published.

This question has no answer in existing methodology books because they do not ask it. This is not a criticism of those books. It is a distinction of purpose.

Twentieth-century science was built inside institutions, with controlled access to instruments, journals, and peer reviewers. That system produced real knowledge and continues to produce it. But it also created epistemic barriers that are not conditions of validity of knowledge: institutional affiliation, the author's native language, access to paid publishing platforms, and the availability of time and resources to navigate long review cycles.

Twenty-first-century science has new instruments: open repositories with persistent identifiers, asynchronous collaboration between researchers without common affiliation, computational tools accessible outside certified laboratories, and AI systems that function as condensation partners for decades of accumulated work. These instruments make possible a type of scientific production that the conventional system did not anticipate and for which existing methodology guides provide no standard.

This manual is the standard for that type of production. It is not a manifesto against institutional science. It is a specification for the science that happens outside it, alongside it, and that needs to be auditable with the same rigor as any work produced inside it.

The five specific contributions of this manual without equivalent in existing guides are: the requirement of self-application as a conformity test; the declaration of epistemic category per individual claim; the derivation chain as a mandatory document element; the public critique template as a constitutive part of the scientific record; and the principle that any person with the template can audit any document without prior credential.

A constitution has fewer pages than a constitutional law textbook. It is not inferior for that. It does something the book does not do.

Part I

Foundations and Manifesto

Knowledge is evaluated by what it is, not by where it was produced.

Foundational principle of this manual

1 The Origin of the Framework

The CAMAF, Critério Alex Moura de Análise Factual (Alex Moura Criterion of Factual Analysis), operates through five components: criteria, argument, method, application, and falsification. It began as the answer to a single question: what is the minimum set of conditions that a representational claim must satisfy to be treated as fact rather than opinion, independently of its origin?

The question did not originate in a seminar.

In August 1989, in a barbershop in Quintino, Rio de Janeiro, a science magazine lay open on a photograph. The Voyager 2 probe had just completed its flyby of Neptune at a distance of 4.4 billion kilometres, and the photograph showed, in clear resolution, rings around the planet.

The problem was simple. School had taught that only Saturn has rings. This was not presented as the best estimate available at the time, nor as the limit of what instruments could detect at that moment, nor as a provisional conclusion pending further observation. It was taught as fact. It appeared that way in tests. The right answer was Saturn. Any other answer was wrong.

The photograph said otherwise.

The thought that followed was not theoretical. It was: the school lied to me.

At fifteen, without formal vocabulary, without philosophy of science, without epistemology: the school lied. They said only Saturn has rings. The photograph clearly shows Neptune has them too. So what else did they teach me that is not true?

Decades later, when formalising the CAMAF, it became clear that the school had not lied about the fact. It had lied about the status of the fact. The correct statement was not "only Saturn has rings." It was "based on observations available to this date, Saturn is the only planet in which rings have been detected." That statement would have been true, auditable, and correctable. The photograph of Neptune would not have overturned it; it would have confirmed it, because it included its own condition of revision.

The error was not in the content. It was in the absence of declaration. A provisional statement presented without the declaration of its provisionality is not an incomplete statement: it is a statement with the wrong epistemic category. This is what Axiom 11 of the CAMAF formalises: the validity of a statement depends on transparency about its status, not on the type of statement it is. Facts, inferences, opinions, and narratives are all valid when declared as what they are. The primary source of error is not being wrong: it is not declaring what one knows and what one does not know.

The question from the barbershop was not "does Saturn have rings?" It was: "did they know they had not checked all the planets, and did they write 'only' anyway?"

That question received no formal answer in 1989. It was stored. It generated a habit: when a system presents something as settled, ask what the system would have to look like if it were wrong. Ask what was not inspected before someone wrote "only." Ask what the photograph would show if someone got close enough to look.

The formal answer came much later, built from decades of work in systems where incomplete knowledge presented as complete produced real consequences: equipment that failed because a manual omitted a failure mode; industrial processes that stopped because a specification assumed conditions that did not hold; access control systems that required serial programming from scratch because the proprietary software had not anticipated the specific configuration of the installation.

In each of those cases, the structure was the same as in the barbershop: someone had written "only" when they should have written "as far as we have checked." The cost of the omission was paid later, by someone else, under conditions the original author had not anticipated.

The CAMAF is the structural answer to the barbershop question. It specifies what a knowledge claim must declare so that the next person who reads it knows exactly how far it was checked, what would change it, and what it is not saying. The word "only" is not prohibited. It must be earned.

This manual is the formal answer to the 1989 observation. It specifies what a representational system must declare for its outputs to be auditable, correctable, and cumulative. It does not assume that all existing systems fail this standard. It assumes that the standard must be explicitly stated before compliance with it can be verified.

The derivation chain is public and documented. The CAMAF established what must be declared for a claim to be auditable. The Fundamental Principle of Intelligence (FPI) derived from the CAMAF what every system with attributed intelligence necessarily does. Structuristics derived from the FPI whether the coupled construction-decomposition dynamic is specific to intelligence or common to any organised persistence. The present manual derives from the CAMAF what a document must contain to be produced under that same standard.

2 The Manifesto

2.1 What this manual asserts

1. Knowledge is a property of claims and the reasoning that supports them, not of who produces them.

A claim supported by adequate criteria, a traceable argument, a declared method, a specified domain of application, and a falsification condition is a knowledge claim. This holds independently of whether it was produced in a certified institution, a bedroom, a factory, or a barbershop.

A claim that does not satisfy these conditions is not a knowledge claim. This holds independently of whether it was produced in a university, reviewed by peers, published in a journal with an impact factor, or cited ten thousand times.

2. The mechanisms historically used to approximate epistemic quality are not identical to epistemic quality.

Anonymous peer review, institutional affiliation, journal prestige, citation count, IMRAD structure, English as a mandatory language, and editorial word limits are mechanisms. They are not definitions of quality. They are proxies that emerged from specific historical, geographical, technological, and institutional constraints, and have been retained beyond the conditions that justified them.

This manual does not assert that these mechanisms have no value. It asserts that their value is contingent and partial, that their limitations are documented and significant, and that an explicit standard can replace the function they claim to perform without inheriting their failure modes.

3. Criticism is a structural component of knowledge, not an attack on knowledge itself.

A document that cannot be publicly criticised under a traceable protocol is not a knowledge document. It is a declaration. The audit protocol specified in Part VI of this manual is not an optional feature. It is the mechanism by which knowledge documents distinguish themselves from declarations.

4. Transparency about the conditions of production is not weakness.

Declaring that a document was produced with AI assistance, that its author has a financial relationship with a relevant party, that a prediction was not pre-registered, or that a prior version contained an error is not an admission of failure. It is the basic condition for auditability. A document that does not make these declarations is not a stronger document. It is a less auditable one.

5. The right to produce and evaluate knowledge does not require a credential.

Credentials are useful as signals of training. They are not conditions of validity.

The horizon, what a fully realised knowledge claim requires, is stated in this section: criteria, traceable argument, method, domain, falsification. The conditions of full conformity with that horizon, the standard by which a document becomes fully auditable and accountable, are declared in the fifteen standards of this manual.

Anyone who meets those fifteen standards has produced a fully conformant knowledge document. Anyone who has not met them has not produced a fully conformant document under this manual's terms, regardless of their credentials.

2.2 What this manual does not assert

This manual does not assert that institutional science is fraudulent, that peer review produces no value, that journals should be abolished, or that credentials are worthless.

It asserts that these mechanisms are insufficient as sole arbiters of knowledge quality, that their limitations are known and under-reported, and that an explicit, publicly auditable standard can perform the epistemic function they claim to perform more reliably than they currently do.

This manifesto is the central claim of this manual. It is not an appendix, a preamble to be skipped, or a provocation. It is the reason the standards exist in the form they do. Every standard in this manual derives from this manifesto, and the manifesto is accountable to the same standards it establishes.

3 The Derivation Chain

This document belongs to a derivation chain. The chain is declared here both as acknowledgment of intellectual debt and as a demonstration of the standard this manual promotes: every document must be transparent about what it derives from and where it departs from its sources.

1. CAMAF Operational Standard Compliance Reference (Moura, 2026, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19990064): the foundational framework that specifies conditions for auditable representational claims and the compliance protocol for all derived work. Standards 1 through 8 of this manual are derived directly from this document.

2. The Moura Fundamental Principle of Intelligence (FPI) and the CAMAF Axiomatic Framework (Moura, 2026, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19325926): application of CAMAF to the question of what every system with attributed intelligence necessarily does. Demonstrates that the CAMAF framework is substrate-independent. Introduces Axiom 11, which formalises the operational principle identified in the 1989 barbershop: the validity of a statement depends on transparency about its status, not on the type of statement it is.

3. Structuristics v1.3.0 (Moura, 2026, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19636897): derivation from FPI of a formal field for constructive-decompositional dynamics across domains. Documents a functional example of a research programme produced under CAMAF compliance and introduces independent empirical evidence, via parallel identification by Solazzo (2026), that formally derived structural properties correspond to real geometric needs in the domains where they are applied.

4. This manual: specifies what any document must contain to be produced under the standard the above chain exemplifies.

The chain is not circular. Each document answers a different question. The CAMAF asks what must be declared. The FPI asks what intelligence does. Structuristics asks whether the C/D dynamic is universal. This manual asks what a compliant document looks like in practice.

The chain is also not closed. It is an ongoing research programme. Documents derived by third parties that declare the derivation chain and satisfy the fifteen standards of this manual are part of the same structure, independently of authorisation from the original author. The declaration of the chain is the epistemic condition. Authorisation is not.

Part II

The Standards

3 Preface to Part II

The fifteen standards of this manual are organised as follows. Each standard has three components.

The first is the standard itself: what the document must do or declare. The second is the rationale: why this condition is a knowledge condition and not merely a formatting preference.

The third is the critique of conventional practice: where the conventional substitute for this standard fails the epistemic function it claims to perform.

The critique component is not separable from the standard. It explains why the standard takes the form it does and why an alternative formulation would be inadequate. The critique is not a polemical appendix. It is part of the specification.

4 Standard 1: Criteria Declaration

Every document must declare, explicitly and in a dedicated section, the criteria that distinguish its claims from opinion. The criteria declaration must specify: (a) what type of evidence would count as support for the central claim; (b) what type of evidence would count against it; (c) what the document does not claim.

4.1 Rationale

A claim without stated criteria for its evaluation is not falsifiable. A claim that is not falsifiable is not a knowledge claim: it is a declaration of preference, belief, or opinion. The criteria declaration is not a formality. It is the condition under which a claim enters the space of statements that can be evaluated, challenged, corrected, or confirmed.

The specification of what the document does not claim is as important as the specification of what it does claim. Systems that present the incomplete as complete without declaring their limits are the canonical failure mode that the CAMAF was designed to address. The explicit non-assertion declaration prevents this failure mode.

4.2 Critique of conventional practice: claims as conclusions

The conventional structure of an academic document places claims as conclusions, arrived at after method and data. The criteria for evaluating the claims are often implicit in the method section, when stated at all. The reader is expected to infer what would count against the claim from the description of what was done to support it.

This practice works adequately when the method is well understood, the domain is narrow, and the reader is a specialist in the same subdomain as the author. It fails when any of these conditions is absent. In interdisciplinary work, in new fields, and in documents produced outside established institutional frameworks, the implicit criteria are not recoverable by the reader.

The criteria declaration required by Standard 1 makes explicit what conventional practice leaves implicit. It does not add work to a well-specified document. It makes visible the specification that should already be there.

5 Standard 2: Argument Structure

The central argument of the document must be traceable. A traceable argument is one

in which: (a) premises are distinguished from conclusions; (b) the inferential steps are declared; (c) the argument does not depend on premises whose status (empirical, definitional, or assumed) has not been declared.

5.1 Rationale

Traceability is the property that allows an argument to be evaluated by anyone who reads it, not only by specialists who share the author's background assumptions. An argument that cannot be traced cannot be audited. An argument that cannot be audited is not a knowledge argument: it is an authority argument.

The distinction between premises and conclusions is not a logical pedantry. It is the operational condition for the type of public audit specified in Part VI of this manual. A critic who cannot identify where the premises end and the conclusions begin cannot specify which component they are challenging.

5.2 Critique of conventional practice: argument by expertise

The dominant convention in academic writing conflates argument with narrative, treating one as if it were the other. A method section followed by a results section followed by a discussion is a chronological account of a research process, not an argument. The argument must be reconstructed by the reader from this narrative, and the reconstruction is not trivial.

In high-prestige journals, this reconstruction is frequently replaced by deference: the argument is assumed sound because the author is credentialed, the journal is ranked, and the reviewers were anonymous specialists. This substitution is not epistemically inert. It means that the authority of the author, the journal, and the review process does the work that the traceability of the argument should do.

Standard 2 rejects this substitution. The argument must be traceable independently of the authority of its source.

6 Standard 3: Method Declaration

Every document must declare its method. The method declaration must specify: (a) how the evidence or data were obtained or constructed; (b) what restrictions or limitations the method introduces; (c) what the method cannot determine, even in principle.

6.1 Rationale

A result without a declared method cannot be reproduced, extended, or challenged on methodological grounds. It can only be accepted or rejected. Neither acceptance nor rejection for reasons other than the method constitutes knowledge evaluation.

The declaration of what the method cannot determine is a specific CAMAF requirement not present in most methodological frameworks. Its purpose is identical to that of the non-assertion declaration in Standard 1: to prevent the presentation of incomplete results as complete.

6.2 Critique of conventional practice: IMRAD as universal structure

The Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion structure, IMRAD, was developed for empirical laboratory science and was progressively adopted from the 1940s through the 1980s, becoming the dominant standard in biomedical publishing and then extended to most academic disciplines (Sollaci and Pereira, 2004). This extension occurred with minimal modification and without systematic evaluation of adequacy to other types of work. In theoretical work, there are no "results" in the empirical sense. In framework proposals, the IMRAD structure misrepresents or actively distorts what the document is doing: the "results" are not outputs of a data collection process, but derivations from declared premises.

IMRAD is not required by this manual. Documents produced under this manual must declare their method, but the method does not need to be presented in IMRAD sequence. The document type, specified in Part III, determines which sections are appropriate. For readers familiar with IMRAD, Appendix A of this manual provides the correspondence map between CAMAF elements and IMRAD elements.

7 Standard 4: Domain of Application

Every document must specify its domain of application: the set of conditions under which the document's claims are intended to hold. Claims made without domain specification are not falsifiable in practice, because no observation outside the implicit domain can count as evidence against them.

7.1 Rationale

Domain specification is the complement of criteria declaration. Standard 1 specifies what counts as evidence for or against the claim. Standard 4 specifies where that evidence would be gathered: the conditions, the population, the system, or the class of cases to which the claim applies.

A claim that applies everywhere applies nowhere in a falsifiable sense. Domain specification closes this exit.

7.2 Critique of conventional practice: implicit universalisation

Academic papers routinely overstate their domain of application. Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan (2010) documented that the vast majority of participants in behavioural science studies come from Western, Educated, Industrialised, Rich, and Democratic societies, which the authors called WEIRD, representing a narrow and atypical slice of global human variation. Despite this, the conclusions of these studies are published with claims about human behaviour in general. These domain violations are rarely identified by anonymous peer review, because reviewers are selected for expertise in the method, not in the validity of the generalisation.

Standard 4 requires explicit domain specification. If the author believes the claim is universal, they must declare that and provide the argument for universality. In either case, the specification is part of the auditable record.

8 Standard 5: Falsification Conditions

Every document must declare its falsification conditions: the specific observations, results, or logical demonstrations that would require the author to retract, significantly modify, or substantially qualify the central claims. A document without declared falsification conditions is a declaration, not a knowledge claim.

8.1 Rationale

The falsification conditions are the operationalisation of the epistemic principle that a claim that cannot be falsified in principle is not a scientific claim. This manual does not require every claim to satisfy a strict Popperian criterion. It requires that the author specify, in advance, what would change the claim.

The reason for advance specification is not philosophical formalism. It is protection against motivated post-hoc revision: the tendency to reinterpret disconfirming evidence as irrelevant, as exceptions, or as evidence for a modified version of the claim that the disconfirmation does not reach.

8.2 Critique of conventional practice: post-hoc prediction

The pattern of "consistent with our hypothesis" that permeates empirical research is not a falsification condition. A hypothesis that cannot specify what "consistent" means cannot specify what "inconsistent" means.

The convention of declaring predictions after data collection has produced a replication crisis in multiple empirical disciplines. The Reproducibility Project coordinated by the Open Science Collaboration (2015) replicated 100 studies published in three high-prestige psychology journals and found statistically significant results in only 36% of replications, against 97% of the original studies. Pre-registration, Standard 13, addresses the temporal component of this problem. Standard 5 addresses the logical component: the falsification condition must be declared regardless of whether the work is pre-registered, and must be specific enough that a third party can, in principle, determine whether it has been satisfied.

9 Standard 6: Epistemic Category and Support Level Declaration

Every document must identify the epistemic category of each main claim: **empirical** (supported by observation or data), **theoretical** (derived from prior premises by logical argument), **definitional** (true by the way terms are defined in this document), or **assumed** (taken as a starting point without derivation in this document). Claims that mix categories without declaring the mix are not auditable.

In addition to the category, each empirical or theoretical claim must declare its support level, according to the five levels defined in this standard.

9.1 The Five Support Levels

Level 1: Formal derivation. The claim follows necessarily from declared premises by logical argument without gaps. Equivalent to mathematical proof. Does not require empirical evidence to support the claim within the formal system in which it was derived.

Level 2: Experimental confirmation with circularity control. The claim is supported by data independent of the premises that generated it, with declared protocol, pre-registered where applicable, and auditable by third parties. Includes explicit control of circularity between hypothesis and data.

Level 3: Non-exhaustive empirical evidence. The claim is supported by observations consistent with it, but without coverage of the entire space of possible cases. Coverage limitations must be declared.

Level 4: Independent convergence. The claim has been reached by two or more researchers without prior communication about the specific result, starting from distinct frameworks. This level is specific to CAMAF and has no equivalent in conventional methodology guides. Independent convergence does not prove the claim, but increases its epistemic probability non-redundantly because the systematic errors of the two frameworks are different. The Odrzywolek and Solazzo cases documented in this manual's derivation chain are instances of this level.

Level 5: Theoretical argumentation. The claim is supported by reasoning coherent with the framework, without direct empirical evidence yet available. This is the minimum level for a theoretical claim to be publishable under this manual, provided it is accompanied by declared falsification conditions and an indication of the type of evidence that would raise the claim to a higher level.

A formal critique may identify that a claim is classified at a higher level than the evidence supports. This is a valid critique of the declared level, not of the claim itself, and must be treated as such in the Part VI response protocol.

9.2 Rationale

The conflation of epistemic categories is one of the most common and least flagged sources of invalid inference in academic writing. An empirical observation is treated as having theoretical implications without the inferential step being shown. A definitional claim is used as if it were an empirical finding. An assumption is left implicit and then cited as if it had been established.

The five support levels address an additional problem that categories alone do not resolve: two claims can both be "empirical" but supported by radically different quantities of evidence. The level declares this difference in an auditable form.

9.3 Critique of conventional practice: citation as category validation

A practice that Standard 6 addresses directly is the use of citation to elevate an assumption to the status of established fact. The claim is assumed in document A; document B cites document A for that claim; document C cites documents A and B; by the third iteration, the claim has acquired the appearance of a finding because it was cited three times by credentialed authors in ranked journals.

This mechanism is the documented driver behind several well-known cases of erroneous findings that circulated for decades before being identified. Citation is not a substitute for epistemic category and support level declaration. Standard 6 requires both to be declared independently of what was cited.

10 Standard 7: Version and Amendment Record

Every document must carry an explicit version identifier and a record of substantive amendments. The version record must: (a) identify content changes, not only formatting changes; (b) identify changes that alter prior claims; (c) identify corrections of prior errors, with description of the error corrected.

This manual adopts Semantic Versioning 2.0.0 (semver.org) as its versioning system. The **public API** of a CMAF document is the set of claims, definitions, and standards that other documents cite. Version compatibility means: a citation made to version X.Y.Z for claim C remains valid as long as the MAJOR version does not change.

PATCH (x.y.Z): form only. Typography, spacing, errata corrections. No claim, argument, or section changed. A reader who cited the prior version cites the same claim with the same precision.

MINOR (x.Y.z): new content added without breaking existing content. New sections, new examples, new predictions, additional evidence. A citation made to v1.2.0 for claim X remains valid after v1.3.0. When the MINOR version is incremented, PATCH is reset to zero.

MAJOR (X.y.z): breaking change. A prior claim is retracted, a standard is substantially redefined, or a central definition changes such that prior compliance declarations may have become incorrect. When the MAJOR version is incremented, MINOR and PATCH are reset to zero.

Versions below 1.0.0 (0.y.z) signal that the public API is not yet stable. Version 1.0.0 declares the API as public and stable.

10.1 Rationale

Knowledge is cumulative and correctable. These two properties require that the record of a document's development be publicly accessible. A document that has been silently revised cannot be cited with confidence: the citation may refer to a version whose claims have since been qualified or retracted.

10.2 Critique of conventional practice: the published paper as static object

The journal publication model treats a paper as a static object once published. Corrections are published separately and rarely linked to the original article in citation databases. The result is that a substantial proportion of the literature cited in active research refers to versions of claims that have since been qualified, corrected, or retracted.

The versioned document model resolves one problem specifically: it makes the amendment history of a document a first-class component of its content, not an administrative footnote.

11 Standard 8: Non-Assertion Declaration

Every document must include an explicit declaration of what it does not assert. The non-assertion declaration is not a legal disclaimer. It is a specification of the boundary of the document's contribution. Claims that are possible inferences from the document but are not warranted by its argument must be identified and excluded.

11.1 Rationale

The non-assertion declaration is the symmetric complement of the criteria declaration of Standard 1. Standard 1 specifies what the document claims and what would count as evidence for and against. Standard 8 specifies what the document does not claim and what would be an invalid inference from it.

This standard addresses a failure mode particularly prevalent in theoretical documents: the reader extends the argument beyond the author's intention, citing the document for claims the author never made.

11.2 Critique of conventional practice: implicit scope

The scope of a conventional academic paper is controlled primarily by the abstract and introduction, both typically framed to maximise the apparent relevance of the work. The non-assertion is not declared; the claim is extended as far as the author's confidence in the reviewers' willingness to challenge it reaches.

Standard 8 inverts this incentive at the document level. The non-assertion declaration imposes a cost on overstatement by making the overstatement publicly auditable.

12 Standard 9: Epistemic Autonomy

A document declares what it asserts, not by permission of anyone. Epistemic authority does not transfer by affiliation, seniority, or institutional endorsement. Each claim stands or falls by the criteria, argument, method, domain, and falsification conditions declared in the document itself.

AI use declaration: The use of artificial intelligence in document production must be declared when: (a) the AI tool is the object of study in the document; or (b) substantive text appears in the document without modification by the author. Use of AI as a drafting, formatting, or idea-exploration instrument, where the final text results from the author's substantive revision, does not require declaration.

Critiques without resolution proposal: A critique that identifies a violation without

proposing a resolution is an observation, not a formal critique. It requires acknowledgment but not formal response. The obligation to respond applies only to critiques that include a resolution proposal.

12.1 Rationale

Epistemic autonomy is the principle that the validity of a claim does not depend on the authority of its source. Standard 9 applies this principle to the author's position: the author declares what is claimed, and the claim is evaluated on its own terms.

The AI declaration requirement is a specific example of the general transparency obligation. The question is not whether AI was used, but whether the text the reader is reading is the product of the author's reasoning or the product of a computational system the author is presenting without modification. The definition of "substantive revision" requires judgement. A text that was reformulated, reorganised, extended, corrected, or rejected and rewritten by the author satisfies the condition. A text accepted with minor edits does not.

12.2 Critique of conventional practice: affiliation as credibility proxy

The practice of evaluating claims by the affiliation of their authors is the epistemic error that produces the most consistent damage to knowledge quality. Peters and Ceci (1982) empirically documented this mechanism: they resubmitted twelve already-published papers to high-prestige psychology journals, replacing author names and institutions with fictions, without altering content. The majority were rejected by the same journals that had published them, without reviewers identifying the papers as already known. The result is consistent with the hypothesis that institutional affiliation influences editorial decisions independently of content.

Standard 9 does not eliminate the value of prior information about authors. It specifies that this prior information is not a component of the document's epistemic status. The epistemic status of the document is determined by Standards 1 through 8. Affiliation is not a standard.

13 Standard 10: Language

The author defines the primary language of production. English is mandatory as a secondary language when the primary language is not English. The author is responsible for the conceptual integrity of the English version. When both language versions coexist, the version in the author's native language takes conceptual precedence over the English version, which must be corrected in case of conflict. Authors whose native language is English have no obligation to produce a secondary version.

13.1 Rationale

This standard addresses the asymmetry imposed by the current convention of English as the mandatory primary language of scientific production. The first component is epistemic: concepts native to the author's language may not have direct equivalents in English. When a

non-native speaker writes first in English, they are performing a translation before performing the reasoning. The second component is structural: the requirement to write primarily in English systematically privileges authors whose native language is English, for historical, not epistemic, reasons.

13.2 Critique of conventional practice: English hegemony

The linguistic hegemony of English in scientific publishing is defended on practical grounds, not epistemic ones. These practical reasons are genuine and this standard does not dispute them. It disputes the epistemic implication drawn from them: that work produced in English by native speakers is, thereby, more reliable, more rigorous, or more credible than identical work produced in Portuguese, Mandarin, Arabic, or any other language.

14 Standard 11: Author Contributions

Author contributions must be declared using the CRediT taxonomy adapted for CAMAF-compliant documents. The following roles are added to the standard CRediT taxonomy: **Framework Derivation** (the contributor derived the theoretical structure of the document from a prior framework, with explicit identification of the source framework); **CAMAF Audit** (the contributor verified the document's compliance with the fifteen standards of this manual). Single-author documents must declare which roles were performed by the author.

Identification and contact: Every document must include the author's ORCID as the primary persistent identifier. A scientific correspondence email address is recommended. ORCID is mandatory because it persists independently of changes in institution, email provider, or platform. The correspondence email is recommended to facilitate direct communication, but is optional given the risk of obsolescence. In case of change of contact address, the ORCID profile must be updated and the document's living registry must reflect the current address.

14.1 Rationale

Contribution declaration serves two functions: assignment of responsibility, specifying who is responsible for which components; and credit allocation, distinguishing each author's contribution in a way that citation alone does not capture.

The addition of Framework Derivation as a role reflects the reality that much of the work produced under this framework involves deriving structures from prior frameworks. This type of intellectual work is not captured by the standard CRediT roles.

The CRediT taxonomy adapted for CAMAF-compliant documents retains the fourteen original roles with two revised and adds six specific roles.

The original roles are retained in full with two exceptions: "Investigation" becomes "Investigation or Formal Derivation", covering both empirical data collection and logical derivation from declared premises; "Validation" becomes "Validation or CAMAF Audit", specifying that auditing the fifteen standards is a distinct role with declarable responsibility.

The "Funding Acquisition" and "Resources" roles are declared N/A when no funding or physical resources are involved, without this absence compromising the declaration.

The six added roles are: **Framework Derivation**, where the contributor derived the document's theoretical structure from a prior framework, with explicit identification of the source framework and the transformation performed; **Algorithmic Prose**, where the contributor produced the plain-language versions of formal expressions, satisfying the CS2 accessibility requirement; **Epistemic Classification**, where the contributor categorised the claims by type and support level per Standard 6; **Derivation Chain**, where the contributor identified and declared the document's positioning in the intellectual chain of origin; **Living Registry Curation**, where the contributor is responsible for maintaining the public audit protocol after publication, including responding to formal critiques within the declared timeframe.

For single-author documents, all applicable roles are attributed to the author, and inapplicable ones are declared N/A with justification. The declaration is not a formality: it is the record that allows a critic to identify which author is responsible for which component when a formal critique is submitted.

14.2 Critique of conventional practice: authorship as negotiation

The convention of academic authorship is widely recognised in the sociology of science literature as a site of social negotiation loosely coupled to effective intellectual contribution. Authors are added due to institutional relationships, removed due to power disputes, or ordered by criteria that do not reflect relative contribution. Standard 11 does not prevent these practices through regulation. It prevents them by making the contribution declaration a component of the auditable record: a formal critique can identify a discrepancy between the declared role and the observable contribution, and the Part VI response protocol applies.

15 Standard 12: Conflict of Interests

The author must declare any interest that could affect, or could be perceived as affecting, the objectivity of the document's claims. Conflicts of interest are not limited to financial relationships. They include: (a) financial interests in outcomes supported by the claims; (b) institutional pressures to reach particular conclusions; (c) personal relationships with parties whose work the document evaluates; (d) intellectual investment: the author's prior public commitment to a position the document supports or challenges; (e) career incentives that favour particular results.

15.1 Rationale

The expansion of conflict of interest declaration beyond the financial reflects the empirical literature on research bias. Intellectual investment, the author's prior commitment to a theoretical position, is a documented source of bias that is rarely declared. The declaration of this interest does not invalidate the document. It provides the reader with relevant information to evaluate the claims.

The full protocol specifies, for each category, the declaration threshold and the required format.

Financial: any direct or indirect financial relationship with entities whose work the document evaluates or whose results are affected by its claims. Threshold: any non-trivial financial benefit, including revenue sharing, consulting contracts, or equity stakes. Format: "No declarable financial relationship" or "The author has [relationship X] with [entity Y], which has an interest in [claim Z]."

Institutional: pressure from employers, funders, or institutions to produce specific conclusions. For independent researchers without affiliation, the standard format is: "The author is an independent researcher without institutional affiliation. No declarable institutional pressure." For affiliated authors, the declaration must specify whether the institution has an interest in the conclusions and whether explicit or implicit pressure was present.

Personal relationships: any prior co-authorship, supervision, close friendship, or conflict with persons whose work is evaluated in the document. Threshold: relationships within the last five years or ongoing at the time of publication. Format: "The author has [co-authorship / supervision / collaboration / known conflict] relationship with [name], whose work is [evaluated / cited as convergent / contested] in this document."

Intellectual investment: this is the most important and most CAMAF-specific category. The format is mandatorily explicit: the author lists prior publications that publicly commit to positions this document supports or challenges, with identification of the type of commitment. Example: "The author published [DOI], which defends [position]. This document extends that position. The author's commitment to the defended position is maximal." The declaration does not invalidate the document. It documents the asymmetry so the reader can calibrate their evaluation. A document that defends positions without declaring the author's intellectual investment is not stronger for that: it is less auditable.

Career incentives: for researchers without conventional academic affiliation, the relevant incentive is the reputation of the framework the author has developed. This incentive is structural and not resolvable by declaration, only declarable. Format: "The claims of this document, if confirmed, strengthen the credibility of the [name] framework developed by the author. This incentive is structural, not financial, and is declared, not resolved."

15.2 Critique of conventional practice: financial disclosure as complete disclosure

The convention has converged on financial disclosure as its primary content. This has produced a literature in which the most common and most influential sources of bias (intellectual investment, institutional pressure, and career incentives) are entirely undeclared.

16 Standard 13: Pre-registration

When applicable, documents must be pre-registered before the start of data collection. For theoretical documents without data, the functional equivalent is the public declaration of predictions before their evaluation: a prediction declared in a document submitted to public registration before the evaluation of that prediction constitutes functional pre-registration.

16.1 Rationale

Pre-registration imposes a verifiable temporal separation between prediction declaration and its evaluation. A prediction made after data collection is not a prediction: it is a post-hoc description presented in the grammatical form of a prediction.

The functional pre-registration protocol for theoretical work has three components.

The first is the definition of evaluation event: any systematic attempt, by any party including the author, to determine whether the document's predictions hold. This includes bibliographic searches aimed at confirming or contradicting the predictions, communication with third parties about their results, or analysis of data the author has access to. The evaluation event must be definable before it occurs, not reconstructed afterwards.

The second is the deposit protocol: before the evaluation event, the author deposits a predictions document in a repository with a persistent identifier, containing only the numbered list of predictions with their falsification conditions, without the full argument. This deposit constitutes the functional pre-registration. The main document, when published, cites the DOI of the pre-registration and declares the temporal relationship between the deposit and the evaluation event.

The third is the alternative declaration for when pre-registration was not done, which is preferable to silence. The format is: "The predictions of this document were not pre-registered in the functional sense above. They were formulated [before any systematic analysis of available evidence / during analysis of [evidence X] / after analysis of [evidence Y], which did not include [evidence Z]]." This declaration does not violate Standard 13: it satisfies Standard 5, which requires that falsification conditions be declared, and Standard 9, which requires transparency about production conditions. Unrealised pre-registration must be declared as such, not silenced.

16.2 Critique of conventional practice: post-hoc prediction

The practice of reporting findings in the form of confirmed predictions is so normalised that it has acquired a name in the literature: HARKing, Hypothesising After the Results are Known, a term introduced by Kerr (1998) to describe the presentation of post-hoc hypotheses as if they were a priori. Standard 13 addresses this distortion by requiring a verifiable temporal separation between prediction and evaluation.

17 Standard 14: Data, Protocols, and Temporal Precedence

Data and protocols underlying the document's claims must be made available in a form that allows an independent researcher to evaluate, extend, or challenge the work, without contacting the author. The FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) are the reference standard, with the following CAMAF extension: (e) **Auditable**: the analysis protocol must be decomposed to the point where any critic can verify each step individually.

Verifiable precedence: Every document must be deposited in a repository that satisfies four functional requirements: (1) persistent identifier issued by an independent third party;

(2) publicly verifiable timestamp; (3) free access for the reader; (4) open format. Zenodo is the recommended implementation for reasons of institutional stability declared in this manual.

Dual deposit: At the time of first publication, the document must be deposited simultaneously in two institutionally independent repositories. Zenodo as the primary repository and OSF as the mirror repository are the recommended implementation. Dual deposit is a single action at the time of publication, not an ongoing management obligation. Its justification is to eliminate single point of failure dependency for the precedence timestamp: if the primary repository becomes inaccessible, the mirror preserves the original publication timestamp. Subsequent migration, if necessary, is the upload of the difference to the alternative repository, without recreation of the record.

Wayback Machine: Immediately after dual deposit, the author must submit the primary deposit URL to the Wayback Machine (archive.org). This creates a third independent layer of content preservation, maintained by the Internet Archive, a non-profit organisation with over thirty years of operation. The Wayback Machine does not replace the DOI as a scientific precedence mechanism, but preserves the document's content independently of repository survival.

Declared limit: The verifiable precedence mechanism described in this standard depends on the global persistent identifier infrastructure maintained by DataCite and CrossRef. Complete collapse of that infrastructure would render verifiable precedence unavailable for any traceable scientific production system, not only the CAMAF. This risk is declared as a level-3 assumed premise. Questions of legal validity of precedence in specific jurisdictions are outside the scope of this manual and are the author's responsibility under applicable law.

17.1 Rationale

Open data and open protocols are not a courtesy. They are a condition of reproducibility, and reproducibility is the minimum condition for knowledge claims to accumulate. The operational criterion for "available" is: any independent researcher can replicate the work without contacting the author.

The Auditable extension adds to FAIR what the original principles do not cover: it is not enough that the data are available; the analysis protocol must be sufficiently decomposed for each step to be independently verifiable.

The dual deposit requirement arises from a critical asymmetry in the DOI mechanism: the DOI does not store the document, it stores a pointer to where the document is. If the repository goes down without a transition period, the original timestamp disappears with it. Simultaneous dual deposit at the time of publication eliminates this risk at the operational cost of a single action per document. The author maintains the work in their own repository in open format. If the primary repository fails, the content is already in the mirror with the original timestamp preserved.

Zenodo is adopted as the primary repository because it is maintained by CERN, an intergovernmental organisation with a stable budget and scientific mandate since 1954, funded by the European Commission and integrated into the European Union's research results reporting infrastructure. OSF is recommended as the mirror because it is maintained by the Center for Open Science, a North American organisation institutionally independent of

CERN. Simultaneous failure of both would require two large-scale institutional events to occur independently.

The FAIR adaptation by document type specifies what constitutes "data" in each case and how the Auditable component applies.

New Field Proposal: the data is the derivation. The document is the data. FAIR plus Auditable means: each derivation step is declared as a verifiable proposition; source frameworks are accessible with a persistent identifier; the transformation of each source concept into the derived concept is explicit in plain language. There is no separate data file to deposit. Auditability is satisfied when a reader can verify each proposition individually without contacting the author.

Empirical Paper: standard FAIR applied in full. The Auditable component adds: the analysis protocol must be decomposed to the level where anyone with the original data and the protocol can reproduce every reported number without contacting the author. If the protocol uses software, the code is deposited. If it uses manual analysis, each decision step is documented.

Systematic Review: the data is the search protocol and the inclusion and exclusion matrix. FAIR plus Auditable means: the search protocol is deposited with a persistent identifier before execution; the decision matrix is available for each article evaluated, with the criterion applied to each; inclusion and exclusion criteria are operationalised so that a third party can verify each decision individually.

Framework Convergence Analysis: the data is the structural mapping. Each convergence proposition must be verifiable: the reader must be able to go to document A and document B and confirm that structure X of A corresponds to structure Y of B as declared, without depending on the author's authority to accept the mapping. Identified divergences are declared with the same specificity as convergences.

Public Scientific Communication: the data is the technical source document. The simplified version declares the DOI of the technical document and the specific version being simplified. If the simplification omits qualifications, the omission is declared with indication of where the complete version is available.

17.2 Critique of conventional practice: data available on request

The convention of "data available upon reasonable request" was empirically evaluated by Gabelica, Bojčić, and Puljak (2022), who analysed 3,556 articles published in 333 open access journals with mandatory data availability statements. Among the 1,792 manuscripts whose authors declared they would share data, 93% did not respond or refused to share when asked. The convention serves as a declaration of openness that does not produce openness.

The verifiable precedence requirement has no equivalent in conventional practice because journal publication delegates this function to the journal. A document produced outside the journal system needs to establish its own precedence. Dual deposit with Wayback Machine submission is the operational implementation of this requirement.

18 Standard 15: Retraction and Correction

Correction and retraction are normal components of knowledge production, not punishments. Every document must specify the conditions under which the author commits to issue a correction (claims that were wrong but do not invalidate the central contribution), and the conditions under which the author commits to issue a retraction (claims that were wrong and invalidate the central contribution). Corrections and retractions are versioned events per Standard 7 and must be linked to the original document in all venues where the original was published.

18.1 Rationale

Standard 15 reframes retraction and correction as the operational proof that the document's claims were falsifiable. A document that has been corrected after the identification of an error is a document that worked as intended: the error was visible enough to be identified, the correction mechanism worked, and the record now shows both the original claim and the correction. This is the normal operation of a self-correcting knowledge system.

18.2 Critique of conventional practice: retraction as scandal

The treatment of retraction as a reputational event follows directly from the use of authority and prestige as epistemic proxies. If a paper published in a top journal is treated as validated knowledge by virtue of its publication, then a retraction is evidence that the validation mechanism failed. The observed retraction rate in the literature is consistently lower than what studies on questionable research practices suggest is the actual prevalence of significant errors in published work, indicating that most errors are not formally corrected.

Standard 15 decouples epistemic status from publication venue. A retraction is evidence that Standard 5 worked: the falsification condition was met, the evidence was evaluated, and the claim was revised. This is not a failure. It is the mechanism working.

Part III

Document Types

18 Preface to Part III

The document types defined in this part are not exhaustive. They are the types for which the framework has sufficient experience to specify structures with confidence. Authors producing documents of types not listed here must declare the structure they are using and the rationale for its use.

Each document type has: (a) a definition; (b) sections required for CAMAF compliance; (c) optional sections; (d) positioning relative to the existing literature, specifying what the document inherits, what it replaces, and what it adds; (e) an IMRAD/CAMAF correspondence map where applicable.

19 New Field Proposal

Definition: A document that proposes the existence of a new field of investigation: a domain of questions with distinctive subject matter, a set of operational concepts, a family of methods appropriate to the subject matter, and a research programme that generates testable predictions.

Required sections:

Definition of the field, specifying the question the field addresses that existing fields do not address. Derivation chain, declaring what the field derives and what it contributes that is not present in the source. Core concepts, the minimum vocabulary needed to formulate questions within the field. Method, the class of methods appropriate for this field and why. Positioning relative to the existing literature, declaring what it inherits from existing fields, what it replaces or restructures, and what it adds. Testable predictions, with a minimum of three predictions derivable from the field's central structure that are not derivable from adjacent fields. Open research programme, the questions the field does not yet answer. Non-assertion declaration, what the field does not claim to be or do.

Note on literature review: Instead of an exhaustive literature review that simulates completeness without having it, the new field proposal explicitly declares what it inherits from existing fields with justified point citations, what it replaces or restructures, and what it adds that did not previously exist. This is epistemically more honest than a review that merely appears exhaustive.

IMRAD/CAMAF map:

IMRAD element	CAMAF equivalent
Introduction	Derivation Chain + Criteria Declaration
Method	Method Declaration + Falsification Conditions
Results	Testable Predictions with declared Support Level
Discussion	Domain of Application + Non-Assertion Declaration
Conclusion	Declared Contribution + Open Research Programme

20 Empirical Paper

Required sections: Research question; hypothesis with pre-registration declaration; method with limitation declaration; results with declared epistemic category and support level; positioning relative to the state of the art, declaring the baseline against which the gain is measured; discussion with domain scope; falsification conditions; data availability.

Note: IMRAD is acceptable but not mandatory. Pre-registration, Standard 13, applies in full form. The baseline must be the best known existing model, and the gain must be measured against it in a quantifiable way.

21 Systematic Review

Required sections: Review question; inclusion and exclusion criteria with justification; search protocol (date, databases, terms); evaluation criteria for included documents; synthesis of findings with support level; non-assertion declaration; protocol availability.

Note: The support level for findings is not the statistical level of any individual study, but the reviewer's assessment of how well the body of evidence satisfies Standards 1 through 8.

22 Framework Convergence Analysis

Definition: A document that analyses the structural relations between two or more existing frameworks developed independently. This document type is not currently recognised as a standard academic genre, and its inclusion here constitutes a proposal for its recognition.

Rationale for inclusion: The identification of structural isomorphisms between independently derived frameworks is a form of knowledge production that does not fit comfortably into empirical, review, or theoretical categories. It requires: understanding each framework on its own terms; identifying shared structural features that are not artefacts of common terminology; specifying what the convergence confirms or challenges in each framework.

Required sections: Frameworks analysed; criteria for real structural isomorphism, distinguishing it from superficial terminological similarity; identified convergences with evidence; identified divergences with characterisation; implications for each framework; non-assertion declaration, especially: convergence is not confirmation unless both frameworks are independently validated.

23 Comment and Response

For Comments: The challenged claim must be precisely identified: document, version, section, claim number where applicable. The challenge must specify which standard the claim violates or what evidence contradicts it. A resolution proposal must be included, per Standard 9.

For Responses: The response must address the specific challenge, not the general topic. It must specify whether the challenge is accepted (with description of the correction and revised version), rejected (with specific argument), or acknowledged as outside scope (with specification of where it would be appropriately addressed).

24 Public Scientific Communication

Definition: A document addressed to a non-specialist audience that communicates results or concepts from specialised work.

Public scientific communication is any communication of results or concepts from technical work addressed to a non-specialist audience, regardless of format: text, video, interview, social media post, or oral presentation.

The epistemic legitimacy of a public communication does not derive from its simplification, but

from its declared relationship with the technical source document. Three principles govern this relationship.

Principle 1: non-extrapolation. Public communication does not make claims that the technical document does not make. Simplification is permitted and desirable; omission of qualifications without declaration is not. "CAMAF shows that the credibility of a claim does not depend on where you work" is a legitimate simplification of a complex technical claim. "CAMAF proves that institutional science is false" is not, because the technical document explicitly denies that claim.

Principle 2: declared traceability. Every public communication of CAMAF-compliant work includes the DOI of the technical source document, in any format and on any platform. Inclusion of the DOI is not a credibility ornament: it is the mechanism by which the reader who wants to evaluate the full claims can find them without relying on the simplified version.

Principle 3: responsibility for known citation. The author is responsible for public communication made by third parties citing their work only when they were consulted about it and did not correct an incorrect claim. An incorrect citation that the author knows about and does not correct is a violation of Standard 15 applied to the act of communication itself.

Two operational requirements: every public communication declares the DOI of the technical source document; when the communication simplifies important qualifications, it declares that it simplifies, with indication of where the complete version is available.

One restriction: public communication that presents unconfirmed predictions as confirmed results violates Standard 5 applied to the act of communication, even if the technical document declares the correct status. The epistemic status of claims does not change between the technical and public versions.

Part IV

Algorithmic Prose

25 Definition

What is algorithmic prose

Algorithmic prose is ordinary language written with sufficient precision that any attentive reader can follow each step of the argument without having to guess what the author meant.

It is not poetry. It is not code. It does not require specialised vocabulary. It is the kind of explanation a good teacher gives when they want the student to actually understand, not just memorise. It is what you do when you explain how to get to a place using landmarks instead of coordinates: "turn left at the red market, go straight to the traffic light, the building is the third on the right." Anyone who has ever done that has used algorithmic prose.

What makes a piece of prose algorithmic is a single property: if you remove all technical terms and all symbolic expressions from the text, the argument must still be followable.

If the argument disappears when the symbols are removed, it was not in the prose. It was hidden behind it.

This box is an example of algorithmic prose explaining algorithmic prose.

26 Why the name does not mean what it seems

"Algorithmic" evokes code, machinery, formalism. "Prose" evokes literature, fluidity, subjectivity. The combination may suggest that the author needs to write with mathematical precision in literary language, which would intimidate exactly the public that CS1 wants to include.

The name is technical for a precise reason: an algorithm is a sequence of steps that anyone can execute if the steps are sufficiently specified. Algorithmic prose is prose where the steps of the argument are sufficiently specified that any attentive reader can execute them, verify them, and identify where they disagree. The "algorithmic" is not in the language. It is in the structure of the argument that the language carries.

27 Joint motivations

The requirement of algorithmic prose has three joint motivations: each independently justifies the requirement, and together they establish it as non-optional in CS2 and CS3 documents.

Motivation 1: CAMAF compliance. A document that can only be evaluated by readers who know the relevant formal notation is a document whose claims are accessible to a restricted audience. The criteria, the argument, and the falsification conditions must be accessible to any sufficiently attentive reader. If they are only accessible to specialists in the formal system, the CAMAF audit cannot be performed by the public.

Motivation 2: Universality of the field. The framework developed in these documents applies to all domains involving representation, organisation, or structured knowledge. The universality of the claim requires that it be statable in terms not specific to any one domain's formal vocabulary.

Motivation 3: The right to decomposition without prior credential. Any reader who invests sufficient attention in reading a CS2 or CS3 document must be able to identify the premises, the inferential steps, and the conclusion, and therefore challenge any component of the argument. This right is not contingent on having a degree. It is contingent on the document being written in a way that makes it possible.

28 How to write algorithmic prose

1. Every formal expression has a verbal equivalent. When a symbolic expression is introduced, it must be followed, or preceded, by a sentence that states in ordinary language what the expression says. The verbal equivalent is not a paraphrase of the notation: it is an independent statement of the same content.

2. The verbal equivalent is self-contained. A reader who skips all symbolic expressions

and reads only the verbal equivalents must be able to follow the argument. The symbolic expressions are a compact notation for readers who find them easier to manipulate. The prose is the argument.

3. Inferential steps are stated. "Therefore," "it follows that," "this means that" and their equivalents are not connectors. They are claims that the step from premise to conclusion is valid. When such a connector appears, the reader has the right to ask why that step follows from the previous one.

4. Technical terms are defined on first use. A term not defined in ordinary language on first use is an obstacle for a reader who does not know it. Technical terms may be retained; they cannot be left undefined.

5. Structural claims are made structurally explicit. If the argument has a structure (if-then, for all, there exists, assume, show), that structure must be explicitly stated at the point where it appears.

29 How to audit algorithmic prose

Three questions. If all three have affirmative answers, the passage is algorithmic prose.

First: if I remove all symbolic expressions and all technical terms, is the argument still here? Second: can I identify where each conclusion begins and where each premise ends? Third: if I disagree with a step, can I point to exactly which step I am challenging?

30 Ten examples by domain

30.1 Example 1: Everyday life

Without algorithmic prose: "The optimal route minimises travel time subject to traffic constraints."

With algorithmic prose: To get there faster, you need to avoid the two points where traffic always stops at this time of day: the market corner and the overpass. If you take the longer route via the back street, you travel more kilometres but make fewer stops, and in practice you arrive ten minutes earlier. If the overpass traffic is normal today, the short route is better. If it is jammed, the long route wins.

What changed: The version without algorithmic prose says what it intends but not how. The version with algorithmic prose states the conditions, the two congestion points, and the decision rule. A reader who disagrees can point exactly where: "the overpass is not jammed at that time" or "the back street has a traffic light that cancels the gain."

30.2 Example 2: Mathematics

Formal expression: $\forall f \in \mathcal{E}, \exists x, y \in \mathbb{R} : f = \text{eml}(x, y)$

With algorithmic prose: For every elementary function (the standard family of exponentials, logarithms, trigonometric functions and their inverses), it is possible to find two real numbers x and y such that applying the EML operator, defined as $\exp(x) - \ln(y) + 1$, yields exactly

that function. This means that a single operator generates the entire family of elementary functions. The structural implication is that removing the logarithmic component collapses the set of generable functions. Without \ln , the operator can no longer reach the whole family.

What changed: The formal expression is compact and precise for readers of mathematical notation. Algorithmic prose allows any reader to verify the central claim without knowing what \forall means.

30.3 Example 3: Physics

Technical claim: "Newtonian gravity fails to predict the precession of Mercury's perihelion."

With algorithmic prose: Newton described gravity as a force between two bodies depending on their masses and the distance between them. This description works very well for most planets: predicted orbits match observed ones. Mercury is the exception. The point closest to the Sun in Mercury's orbit, the perihelion, should remain fixed according to Newton. In practice it shifts slowly over centuries, about 43 arcseconds per century beyond what the influence of the other planets explains. Newton does not predict this shift. Einstein does: in general relativity, the space around the Sun is curved by the solar mass, and that curvature produces exactly the observed shift. Mercury's case is an example of a satisfied falsification condition: a precise prediction, a precise observation, and a discrepancy the model cannot absorb.

What changed: The technical claim is correct but does not say why it matters or what "fails" means. Algorithmic prose states the mechanism, the specific prediction, the specific observation, the quantified discrepancy, and the alternative that resolves it.

30.4 Example 4: Biology

Technical claim: "Bacterial antibiotic resistance emerges through selective pressure on populations with pre-existing genetic variation."

With algorithmic prose: When you take an antibiotic, it kills most of the bacteria causing the infection. But in a population of millions of bacteria, some have genetic variations that make them slightly less sensitive to the antibiotic. Those bacteria survive while the others die. If you stop taking the antibiotic early because you feel better, these resistant bacteria reproduce and repopulate. The next time you take the same antibiotic, it will work less because the bacterial population now consists of a larger proportion of resistant individuals. The resistance was not created by the antibiotic: it was already there in latent form. The antibiotic merely selected which bacteria survived. This is why doctors insist you complete the course even after you feel better: to eliminate the more resistant bacteria before they multiply.

What changed: "Selective pressure" and "pre-existing genetic variation" are precise but opaque to readers without training in evolutionary biology. Algorithmic prose describes the mechanism in terms that anyone who has ever taken antibiotics can recognise and verify.

30.5 Example 5: Law

Technical claim: "The presumption of innocence shifts the burden of proof in criminal proceedings."

With algorithmic prose: In criminal proceedings, the central question is: who needs to prove what? The presumption of innocence answers this question specifically: the accused does not need to prove innocence. It is the State, represented by the prosecution, that must prove guilt. And it must prove it to a specific degree of certainty: beyond any reasonable doubt. This does not mean absolute certainty, which rarely exists in any human situation. It means that after evaluating all the evidence with reason and common sense, whoever judges must be firmly convinced of guilt. If a reasonable doubt remains, the correct decision is acquittal, even if the judge or jury thinks the accused probably committed the crime. The logic is asymmetric by design: the system prefers acquitting a guilty person to convicting an innocent one. This preference is built into the rule of who proves what and to what degree of certainty.

What changed: "Shifting the burden of proof" is precise in legal terms but opaque to readers without legal training. Algorithmic prose describes the operational mechanism step by step: who proves what, to what standard, and what happens when the standard is not met.

Note: This principle does not require a specific academic citation because it is a foundation of Western criminal procedure law, documented since the 13th century and universally enshrined in modern law.

30.6 Example 6: Economics

Technical claim: "Asymmetric incentives between agent and principal produce adverse selection in the credit market."

With algorithmic prose: When a bank lends money, it does not know with certainty whether the borrower will repay. The borrower knows far more about their own financial situation than the bank. This asymmetry creates a problem: the interest rate the bank charges to compensate for default risk is calculated based on the average borrower. But borrowers with good repayment capacity find that rate too high and do not take the loan. Those who remain are precisely those most likely not to repay, because for them the rate is still worthwhile. The bank raises the rate to compensate, which drives away more reliable borrowers, and the cycle continues. The result is a market where the best customers leave and the worst stay, not because the bank wanted this, but because the information structure of the market produces this result automatically.

What changed: "Adverse selection" and "information asymmetry" are precise concepts but require training in economics. Algorithmic prose describes the mechanism step by step so that anyone who has ever dealt with credit can recognise the pattern.

30.7 Example 7: Education

Technical claim: "Educational systems that present provisional knowledge as definitive without declaring epistemic limits produce resistance to later revision."

With algorithmic prose: When a school teaches that "only Saturn has rings" as a settled fact, without declaring that this was the limit of available knowledge at that moment, the student learns two things simultaneously. The first is the declared content: Saturn has rings. The second is the implicit content: the knowledge the school transmits is complete and definitive. The first can be corrected when new evidence arrives. The second cannot: it installs itself as an attitude towards knowledge. The student who learned the second content will resist future revisions not because they disagree with the new facts, but because the structure of what was

taught did not include the possibility of revision. The ability to ask "this might be wrong, and if it is, how would I know?" was atrophied before it could develop.

What changed: The technical claim is precise but abstract. Algorithmic prose anchors it in a concrete example and describes the mechanism of resistance in terms that any educator or former student can recognise from their own experience.

30.8 Example 8: Information Technology

Technical claim: "Systems with high constructive capacity and low verification integrity exhibit traceability collapse under recursive analysis."

With algorithmic prose: A large language model can generate coherent, structured, apparently accurate text on almost any subject. The problem appears when you ask the system to analyse what it has just produced, or to check whether its statements are consistent with each other over a long conversation. At that point, the system often produces analyses that contradict what it said before, or states incompatible things with equal confidence. This is not because the system is lying: it is because it does not have a robust mechanism to track and verify its own earlier claims. It generates well but does not verify well. The result is a system that appears reliable on the surface but cannot audit itself.

What changed: The technical claim uses vocabulary unfamiliar to most IT professionals. Algorithmic prose describes the observable behaviour of systems that anyone who uses language models has already encountered.

30.9 Example 9: Qualitative Research

Technical claim: "Theoretical saturation is not an objective criterion but a researcher's declaration about the state of their analysis."

With algorithmic prose: In qualitative research, data collection is said to have reached saturation when new interviews or observations no longer produce categories or themes not already found. In practice, the researcher decides they have reached this point. There is no fixed number of interviews that guarantees saturation: it depends on the complexity of the phenomenon, the diversity of participants, and the depth of analysis. This does not make the concept useless: it makes it necessary that the researcher explicitly declare why they believe saturation has been reached, which criteria they used, and what would have changed that assessment. Without this declaration, "theoretical saturation" functions as a claim of completeness without an auditable basis.

What changed: The technical claim could be read as a criticism of qualitative methodology in general. Algorithmic prose clarifies that the criticism is not of the concept of saturation, but of the absence of a declared basis for the decision that it has been attained.

30.10 Example 10: Social Systems

Technical claim: "Human decisions are sensitive to the framing of information, not only to its factual content."

With algorithmic prose: Imagine that a disease will kill 600 people and you must choose

between two intervention programmes. In the first scenario, you are told: Programme A saves 200 people for sure; Programme B has a one-third chance of saving all 600 and a two-thirds chance of saving no one. In the second scenario, the same programmes are described as: Programme A results in 400 deaths for sure; Programme B has a one-third chance of zero deaths and a two-thirds chance of 600 deaths. The two scenarios describe exactly the same mathematical outcome: 200 expected survivors in both programmes. The factual content is identical. What changes is only whether the description emphasises who is saved or who dies. Tversky and Kahneman (1981) documented that 72% of people choose Programme A when the scenario is framed in terms of lives saved, but only 22% choose Programme A when the same scenario is framed in terms of deaths. The same information, the same mathematics, the same reality, and systematically different decisions depending on how the information is presented.

What changed: The technical claim is correct but does not say why it matters or how the effect works. Algorithmic prose describes the original experiment with the real numbers, making the central claim verifiable.

Reference: Tversky, A., and Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481), 453–458.

Part V

CAMAF Standards: CS1, CS2, CS3, CSx

30 Preface

30 Reconciliation Note: The Horizon and the Ladder

The manifesto in Part I operates in the definitional regime: it describes the conceptual horizon, the five characteristics that a fully realised knowledge claim possesses. That is the destination.

The CS levels operate in the operational conformity regime: they describe the auditable ladder of approach to that horizon. Each step adds verifiable requirements, and each step is sufficient for the document to be treated as a knowledge claim in an operational sense, that is, as an honest epistemic candidate that precisely declares its current state.

A CS1 document satisfies a subset of the five characteristics: criteria and traceable argument are present; method, domain, and falsification are not required at this step. It is an exploratory or formative knowledge claim, sufficient to be taken seriously and to establish precedence, but not to be treated as tested or mature.

A CS3 document satisfies all five characteristics and all fifteen conditions of full conformity. It is a mature and fully accountable knowledge claim.

The manifesto defines the target. The CS levels define the verifiable milestones on the journey toward it. There is no contradiction between the two regimes because they answer distinct questions: the manifesto answers what knowledge is; the CS levels answer how a document audibly demonstrates that it approaches or satisfies that standard.

The fifteen standards of this manual represent the full production standard. A standard of arrival, not of entry. If the only path is immediate full compliance, no one publishes anything until perfectly compliant, and the framework dies of inanition. The answer is not to lower the standard: it is to create a ladder.

The CAMAF Standards, CS1 through CS3, define this ladder. Each level satisfies all previous ones: a CS3 document is also CS2 and CS1. The progression does not erase the lower layers; it incorporates and sustains them. A document that declares CS2 without satisfying CS1 is not CS2 with problems: it is a dishonest document. The notation is a precise address, not an aspiration.

The progression from CS1 to CS3 corresponds to the natural progression of scientific work: the idea is born exploratory, crystallises into a claim, and assumes temporal responsibility for that claim. The framework does not force this progression: it recognises that it happens and offers a vocabulary to name it precisely.

CSx is reserved for extensions derived by third parties or developed in future versions for specific domains. Any researcher who derives a field from CAMAF and proposes a CS4 for their domain is exercising the right declared in Section 3 of this manual: the derivation chain is the epistemic condition, not authorisation from the original author.

31 CS1: Declarative Transparency

The document declares what it is. This is the minimum floor for a document to be treated as a knowledge claim rather than an uncategorised declaration.

What the author must be able to do before declaring CS1:

Answer three questions in ordinary language, anywhere in the document:

First: what in this text is observed fact or given data? Second: what is my inference from those facts? Third: what does this document not assert?

If the author can answer these three questions honestly, the document satisfies CS1. It does not need a dedicated section, does not need formal vocabulary, does not need a checklist. It needs the answers to be in the text so that an attentive reader can find them.

Corresponding formal standards: 1 (criteria declared), 2 (traceable argument), 7 (version identified), 8 (non-assertion declared).

What CS1 guarantees to the reader: they know what the document claims, what it does not claim, can distinguish fact from inference from opinion within the text, and know which version they are reading.

What CS1 does not require: that the author knows what would falsify the claim. The work may be exploratory. The claim may still be crystallising. CS1 does not penalise the exploratory phase: it honours it by declaring it as such. A novice author who does not yet have the confidence or expertise to formulate falsification conditions for their own work is exactly the phase for which CS1 was created to welcome.

Note on precedence: CS1 combined with deposit in a repository with a persistent identifier establishes public precedence of the idea. The author does not need to have the proof to have the record. They need an honest declaration of what they have.

CS1 is not the basement: CS1 is the baseline that prevents lying by omission. Presenting the incomplete as complete without declaring the limit is exactly what the barbershop question identified in 1989. A document that cannot satisfy CS1 is not at a lower tier: it is not playing the game.

Publication declaration: "This document satisfies CAMAF CS1."

32 CS2: Structural Transparency

The document declares where its claims apply and what would falsify them. CS1 plus the standards that require the claim to be mature enough to be tested.

What the author must be able to do before declaring CS2:

Answer five questions in ordinary language, with prose that any attentive reader can follow without specialised training:

First: under what conditions, for which systems, in what context do the claims of this document apply? If the answer is "everywhere" or "in general," the domain is not specified and the document is still CS1.

Second: what would have to happen for the central claims of this document to be wrong? If the answer is "nothing" or "I don't know," the falsification conditions have not crystallised and the document is still CS1. A falsification condition declared out of obligation without real understanding is worse than absence: it is the bibliographic ornament that CAMAF itself criticises.

Third: how was the evidence or argument constructed? What are the limits of what the method can determine?

Fourth: is each main claim empirical, theoretical, definitional, or assumed? With what support level, from 1 to 5?

Fifth: was this document produced autonomously or with AI assistance without substantive modification?

If the author can answer these five questions honestly, in language that any attentive reader can verify, the document satisfies CS2.

Corresponding formal standards: all of CS1, plus 3 (method with limits), 4 (domain of application), 5 (falsification conditions), 6 (category and support level), 9 (epistemic autonomy), 10 (language).

What CS2 guarantees to the reader: beyond CS1, they know where the claims apply, what would falsify them, with what support level each claim is made, how the document was produced, and can follow the central argument without specialised training.

What CS2 presupposes: that the central claim has crystallised enough to have real falsification conditions. If the author cannot honestly formulate the falsification conditions in ordinary language, the document is still CS1. There is no dishonour in this: it is the actual state of the work being declared with precision.

Algorithmic prose in CS2: mandatory. If you can formulate the falsification condition, you can formulate it in ordinary language. If you cannot make the ordinary language version, the falsification condition is probably not clear even to you.

Publication declaration: "This document satisfies CAMAF CS2."

33 CS3: Full Accountability

The document is accountable for what it claims over time. CS2 plus the standards that create obligations beyond initial publication.

What the author must be able to do before declaring CS3:

Answer four additional questions, all in algorithmic prose that ensures readability by any person at any future time, without depending on the context of the original publication:

First: who did what in this document? What interests (financial, institutional, intellectual, personal) could have influenced the claims?

Second: can any independent researcher replicate this work without contacting the author? Are the data and protocols available with persistent identifiers in two independent repositories?

Third: under what conditions does the author commit to issue a correction? Under what conditions does the author commit to issue a retraction?

Fourth: is there a public address where formal critiques of the document will be recorded and answered?

If the author can answer these four questions with real, non-performative commitment, the document satisfies CS3.

Corresponding formal standards: all of CS2, plus 11 (contributions, ORCID, and contact), 12 (full conflict of interests), 13 (pre-registration where applicable), 14 (open data with dual deposit and Wayback Machine), 15 (retraction and correction with active living registry).

What CS3 guarantees to the reader: beyond CS2, they know who is responsible for each component of the document, know the interests that may have influenced the claims, can independently replicate the work, and know that an active public correction mechanism exists.

Algorithmic prose in CS3: mandatory and full. A CS3 document is one that the author commits to defend over time. Algorithmic prose ensures that the document is readable by any person who encounters it at any future time, without depending on the original publication context. If the argument only works for specialists in the vocabulary of the moment of publication, it does not survive over time.

Publication declaration: "This document satisfies CAMAF CS3."

34 CSx: Declared Extension

Reserved for standards derived by third parties or developed in future versions of this manual for specific domains.

What makes a CSx valid: derivation chain explicitly declared from CS3; additional standards with justification of necessity for the specific domain; no contradiction with CS1, CS2, or CS3; specification document for CSx published under CS3.

A researcher who derives a field from CAMAF and proposes a CS4 for their specific domain is exercising exactly the right declared in Section 3 of this manual: the derivation chain is the

epistemic condition, not authorisation from the original author.

35 Unifying Principle

CS1 guarantees that the document can be read critically. CS2 guarantees that the document can be challenged. CS3 guarantees that the document can be corrected. CSx guarantees that the framework can be extended without being corrupted.

Not every document needs to be CS3. An exploratory article, an initial hypothesis, a quick response to a current debate satisfy CS1 and are already epistemically superior to most of what is published, because they declare what they are instead of pretending to be what they are not. CS3 is for when the author is saying: "this document is my definitive contribution on this subject so far, and I want it to survive the most hostile audit possible." It is not the full armour for every occasion. It is the full armour for when the occasion demands it.

Part VI

Public Audit and Living Registry

36 The Audit as Constitutive Component

Anonymous peer review is a mechanism of validation by contextual authority: the claim is treated as valid because people with relevant credentials, whose names are not declared, concluded that it meets community standards. This mechanism has real value: it filters low technical quality work and connects researchers to the state of the art.

It also has a structural irony that this manual cannot ignore: submitting to anonymous peer review a framework that specifies publicly traceable audit as a knowledge condition would be using the mechanism the framework criticises as the arbiter of the framework's validity. This is not a refusal of criticism. It is a refusal of a specific form of criticism that contradicts the principle being criticised.

The CAMAF response to anonymous peer review is not rejection but functional substitution. The public audit protocol of this Part performs the same epistemic function: identifying standard violations, proposing corrections, recording responses. It does so with three operational differences: the critic is identified; the process is public and remains in the record; and any person with the template can participate, without prior credential.

A document produced under this framework is not complete at publication. It is complete when: (a) it has been submitted to public audit without receiving any unaddressed formal critique; or (b) it maintains a living registry of critiques received and responses. In both cases, the audit is a constitutive component of the document, not an external process that may or may not happen.

37 Self-Declaration

Upon publication, the author declares:

1. That the document was produced under the CAMAF Author's Manual v1.0.x (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20073205).
2. That the author is responsible for responding to formal critiques submitted in compliance with the protocol of Section 39.
3. That the living registry of critiques and responses will be maintained and publicly accessible for a minimum of five years from the date of first publication.
4. That the address or identifier where the living registry is accessible is declared in the document.

38 The Living Registry

The living registry is a public record of: (a) formal critiques received; (b) the author's response to each; (c) amendments made to the document as a result of accepted critiques.

The platform for the living registry is not specified by this manual. The requirement is platform-agnostic: the registry can be maintained as a versioned document, a public thread, a dedicated repository entry, or any other format that is publicly accessible, persistently identified, and linked to the document.

39 Formal Critique: Template

A formal critique submitted to a document produced under this framework must contain four sections:

1. **Standard identification:** The standard or standards allegedly violated. If no specific standard is alleged, the critique is an observation, per Standard 9.
2. **Description with evidence:** A specific description of the violation, with reference to the section and claim in the document where the violation occurs, and evidence supporting the identification of the violation.
3. **Resolution proposal:** A specific and actionable proposal for how the violation could be corrected. A critique without a resolution proposal is an observation. The obligation for formal response applies only to critiques with a resolution proposal.
4. **Good faith declaration:** A declaration that the critique is submitted in good faith: that the critic believes the violation exists, that the evidence supports the identification, and that the resolution proposal is intended to improve the document.

A critique that does not contain all four sections is not a formal critique under this protocol. The author may respond to it at their discretion, but is not required to do so.

40 Response Protocol

The author's response to a formal critique must take one of three forms:

1. **Accept:** The author accepts the critique, specifies the correction, and issues a revised version under Standard 7. The revised version acknowledges the critique and the critic.
2. **Reject with justification:** The author rejects the critique and provides a specific argument for why the identified section does not violate the identified standard or why the evidence does not support the identification.
3. **Acknowledge as outside scope:** The author acknowledges that the critique raises a valid point but that the point is outside the scope of this document, specifying where the point would be appropriately addressed.

The suggested response time is 90 days from receipt of the formal critique. This is a suggestion, not a requirement. Delays must be declared in the living registry.

Part VII

Master Checklist

41 Checklist by Standard

#	Item	Status
<i>Standard 1: Criteria Declaration</i>		
1.1	Evidence supporting the central claim is specified.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2	Evidence counting against the central claim is specified.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3	What the document does not claim is explicitly stated.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Standard 2: Argument Structure</i>		
2.1	Premises are distinguished from conclusions.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2	Inferential steps are declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3	No premise with undeclared status is present.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Standard 3: Method Declaration</i>		
3.1	Method of obtaining or constructing evidence is declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2	Limitations introduced by the method are declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3	What the method cannot determine is declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Standard 4: Domain of Application</i>		
4.1	The domain to which claims apply is specified.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2	The boundaries of that domain are stated.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Standard 5: Falsification Conditions</i>		
5.1	Observations or results that would require retraction are declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>

#	Item	Status
5.2	Observations or results that would require significant qualification are declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Standard 6: Epistemic Category and Support Level</i>	
6.1	Each main claim is categorised as empirical, theoretical, definitional, or assumed.	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.2	Each empirical or theoretical claim has a declared support level (1–5).	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.3	No mixed-category claim without declaration of the mix.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Standard 7: Versioning</i>	
7.1	Version identifier present.	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.2	Amendment record present (if not first version).	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Standard 8: Non-Assertion Declaration</i>	
8.1	The boundary of the contribution is explicitly stated.	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.2	Invalid inferences are explicitly excluded.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Standard 9: Epistemic Autonomy</i>	
9.1	No claim depends on the author's authority for its validity.	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.2	AI use declaration present if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/> / N/A
	<i>Standard 10: Language</i>	
10.1	Native language version present.	<input type="checkbox"/> / N/A
10.2	English version present.	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.3	Conceptual integrity of English version verified by the author.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Standard 11: Author Contributions</i>	
11.1	CRedit-CAMAF contribution declaration present.	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.2	Framework Derivation role declared if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/> / N/A
11.3	CAMAF Audit role declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.4	Author's ORCID present.	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.5	Scientific correspondence email declared (recommended).	<input type="checkbox"/> / N/A
	<i>Standard 12: Conflict of Interests</i>	
12.1	Financial conflicts declared or declared absent.	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.2	Institutional pressures declared or declared absent.	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.3	Personal relationships declared or declared absent.	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.4	Intellectual investment declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.5	Career incentives declared or declared absent.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Standard 13: Pre-registration</i>	
13.1	Full (empirical) or functional equivalent (theoretical) pre-registration declared.	<input type="checkbox"/> / N/A
	<i>Standard 14: Data and Protocols</i>	
14.1	Data or protocols have persistent identifier.	<input type="checkbox"/> / N/A
14.2	Data or protocols accessible without restriction, or restriction declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
14.3	Data or protocols in non-proprietary format.	<input type="checkbox"/> / N/A
14.4	License and reuse conditions declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
14.5	Analysis protocol decomposed to step-by-step verification level.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Standard 15: Retraction and Correction</i>	
15.1	Conditions for correction declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>

#	Item	Status
15.2	Conditions for retraction declared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.3	Living registry address stated.	<input type="checkbox"/>

42 Checklist by Production Phase

42.1 Before writing

- ☐ Document type identified.
- ☐ Criteria declaration drafted.
- ☐ Non-assertion declaration drafted.
- ☐ Conflict of interests assessment completed.
- ☐ Pre-registration archived if applicable.
- ☐ Positioning relative to existing work drafted: what it inherits, what it replaces, what it adds.

42.2 During writing

- ☐ Epistemic category and support level tracked for each main claim.
- ☐ Inferential steps declared at each transition.
- ☐ Algorithmic prose version produced for each formal expression.

42.3 Before publication

- ☐ Full checklist by standard filled.
- ☐ Living registry address identified.
- ☐ Self-declaration prepared.
- ☐ Version identifier assigned.
- ☐ Conceptual integrity of English version verified.

42.4 After publication

- ☐ Living registry active and accessible.
- ☐ Self-declaration linked to the published document.
- ☐ Versioning protocol active for received corrections.

Appendix A: IMRAD/CAMAF Correspondence Map

This appendix is intended for readers familiar with the IMRAD structure who wish to identify where the elements they expect are located in documents produced under this framework.

IMRAD element	CAMAF equivalent	Operational difference
Introduction	Derivation Chain + Criteria Declaration	Explicitly declares what it inherits, what it replaces, what it adds
Literature review	Positioning relative to existing work	Declares selection criteria; no simulation of exhaustiveness
Hypothesis	Testable predictions with support level	Includes levels 1–5 and condition for raising the level
Method	Method Declaration + method limits	Includes what the method cannot determine
Results	Evidence with category and support level	Category and level are mandatory components of the result
Discussion	Domain of Application + Non-Assertion	Limits are mandatory, not optional
Conclusion	Contribution + Open Programme	Declares what remains open with the same emphasis as what was answered
Acknowledgments	Author Contributions (Standard 11)	Specific roles declared, not a narrative of thanks
No equivalent	Falsification Conditions (Standard 5)	No equivalent in conventional IMRAD structure
No equivalent	Living Registry (Part V)	No equivalent in conventional IMRAD structure

42 Version Notes

v0.1.0: Structure approved. Full writing pending.

v0.2.0: First complete draft in English. Fifteen standards written. Seven parts written. Ten pending decisions documented.

v0.3.0: Migration to Portuguese as primary development language. Opening Note added. Section 1 rewritten with the 1989 observation and connection to Axiom 11. D3 resolved: five support levels integrated into Standard 6. IMRAD/CAMAF map added as Appendix A. Standard 14 expanded with Auditable principle.

v0.4.0: Empirical references added: Peters and Ceci (1982), Henrich, Heine and Norenzayan (2010), Open Science Collaboration (2015), Kerr (1998), Gabelica, Bojčić and Puljak (2022),

Sollaci and Pereira (2004). Derivation chain DOIs and titles corrected. Standard 11 expanded with mandatory ORCID and recommended email. Complete references with all corpus DOIs.

v0.5.0: CAMAF acronym corrected: "Critério Alex Moura de Análise Factual" with description of the five operational components. Part IV (Algorithmic Prose) rewritten with self-referential box and ten examples per domain. Part IVB added: CS1, CS2, CS3, CSx with full specification.

v0.6.0: Standard 10 corrected: primary language is the author's choice, not determined by native language. Three language versions initiated.

v0.7.0: All pending decisions resolved. D5: adapted CRediT taxonomy with six additional roles. D6: full conflict of interests protocol with operational thresholds per category. D7: functional pre-registration protocol for theoretical work. D8: FAIR adaptation by document type. D9: full specification of public scientific communication.

v1.0.1: PATCH. Conceptual inconsistency resolved: distinction between the definitional regime of the Manifesto (five characteristics of the horizon) and the operational regime of the CS levels (conditions of full conformity). Manifesto claim 5 rewritten with "full conformity". New section "Reconciliation Note" added at the start of Part IVB. CS1 expanded with sentence on exploratory knowledge claim. No existing claim retracted.

v1.0.0: First stable release. SemVer 2.0.0 adopted with public API declaration. Formatting migrated to template v1.4.1: 2.5cm margins, tcolorbox with accentblue scheme, titlesec. D5–D9 resolved (adapted CRediT, full COI protocol, functional pre-registration, FAIR by type, public communication). Compliance Declaration added with formalbox CS. Author Contributions, Conflict of Interests, and Retraction Conditions added. Version Changelog and Complete Version History in tabular format. Appendix B with v1.4 section architecture. Zero typographic overflows.

42 Methodological Note

This document was produced under the framework it itself specifies. The following declarations apply:

Epistemic category: This document is primarily definitional: it defines what CAMAF-compliant production requires. The definitions are not empirically falsifiable; they are framework specifications. The arguments for the standards (rationale sections) are theoretical: derived from the foundational principles declared in Part I. The critiques of conventional practice in each standard are empirical claims about documented practices.

Support level: Level 5 for the standards themselves (theoretical argumentation). Level 3 for the critiques of conventional practice (non-exhaustive empirical evidence, referable upon request).

Conflict of interests: The author is the developer of the CAMAF framework. This document is an extension of that framework. The intellectual investment is at its maximum: the author has a strong prior public commitment to the positions this document defends. This conflict is declared, not resolved. The reader is invited to evaluate the arguments on their own terms.

AI use: This document was produced with AI-assisted drafting. All substantive text results from the author's structural specification, direction, and revision. No passage appears without substantive modification by the author.

Algorithmic prose: Applied throughout the document. All formal distinctions are stated in

ordinary language in addition to any technical formulation.

42 Author Contributions

Compliance with Standard 11 of the CAMAF Author's Manual v1.0.x. Adapted CRediT-CAMAF taxonomy. Single-author document.

- **Conceptualisation:** Alex Moura.
- **Framework Derivation:** Alex Moura. Derived from the CAMAF Operational Standard Compliance Reference (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19990064).
- **Formal Analysis:** Alex Moura.
- **Methodology:** Alex Moura.
- **Algorithmic Prose:** Alex Moura. Plain-language equivalents produced for all formal expressions.
- **Epistemic Classification:** Alex Moura. Categories and support levels declared in the Methodological Note.
- **Derivation Chain:** Alex Moura. Positioning in the intellectual chain declared in Section 3.
- **Living Registry Curation:** Alex Moura. Responsible for responding to formal critiques submitted per the Part VI protocol.
- **Writing:** Alex Moura.
- **Validation or CAMAF Audit:** Alex Moura.
- **Funding Acquisition:** N/A. No external funding.
- **Resources:** N/A. No institutional physical or computational resources involved.
- **ORCID:** 0009-0009-4427-0540
- **Contact:** alex.moura@structuristics.org

42 Conflict of Interests

Compliance with Standard 12 of the CAMAF Author's Manual v1.0.x. Full five-category protocol declared.

- **Financial:** No declarable financial relationship with entities whose work this document evaluates or whose results are affected by its claims.
- **Institutional:** The author is an independent researcher without institutional affiliation. No declarable institutional pressure.

- **Personal relationships:** Alberto Solazzo, whose work is cited as an example of independent convergence (Level 4), is a collaborator of the author in exchange of ideas about frameworks. No co-authorship or formal supervision relationship.
- **Intellectual investment:** The author is the developer of the CAMAF framework and all documents comprising the derivation chain cited in this manual. This document defends and consolidates that framework. The intellectual commitment to the positions defended is maximal. This conflict is declared, not resolved. The reader is invited to evaluate the arguments on their own terms, per Standard 9.
- **Career incentives:** The claims of this document, if widely adopted, increase the visibility and credibility of the CAMAF framework developed by the author. This incentive is structural, not financial, and is declared, not resolvable by declaration.

42 Conditions for Correction and Retraction

Compliance with Standard 15 of the CAMAF Author's Manual v1.0.x. The living registry address for formal critiques is alex.moura@structuristics.org.

Correction will be issued as a new PATCH version when: a peripheral claim is factually incorrect but does not invalidate the central contribution; a bibliographic reference is incorrect; a typographical error alters the meaning of a claim.

Retraction will be issued as a new MAJOR version when: a standard is defined in a way that contradicts the foundational principle declared in the Manifesto; a falsification condition is satisfied such that the central claim of this document, that the credibility of a knowledge claim is a property of the claim and the reasoning, not of who produces it, must be substantially revised; or a logical derivation contains an error that invalidates an entire standard.

Corrections and retractions are versioned events per Standard 7 and will be linked to this document in all venues where it was published.

42 Acknowledgments

Alberto Solazzo (RENS framework, independent identification of the need for threshold calibration) provided the first external test of the CAMAF framework in a document produced without prior knowledge of the framework. His work demonstrated that the framework identifies genuine structural features, not idiosyncratic preferences of its author.

Appendix B: Recommended Section Architecture v1.4

This appendix specifies the canonical section order for documents produced under the CAMAF Author's Manual v1.0.x, as implemented in template v1.4.0 (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20073205). The order is mandatory for documents that declare compliance with the template. Documents with justified custom structure, such as this manual, may diverge with explicit declaration of the justification.

1. **Title page.** Includes: document type, semantic version, status (0.y.z for Working Draft, 1.0.0+ for stable), DOI, date via \today, author, ORCID, email.
2. **Abstract.** Summary of the central argument, derivation chain, main result, epistemic status.
3. **Table of contents.** Generated automatically.
4. **Version Changelog.** Current version only, with date and brief description. Notice with link to the complete history at the end. Date always hardcoded (never \today in this table).
5. **CAMAF Compliance Declaration.** Full CS1/CS2/CS3/CSx hierarchy with indicator of the document's position. Satisfied standards declared by paragraph.
6. **Origin Declaration.** Author, source frameworks, contribution type, derivation chain, epistemic status.
7. **Epistemic Labels.** Table of categories used in the document (Fact, Inference, Hypothesis, Confirmed Lv. X, Narrative).
8. **Introduction.** Motivating observation, scientific inference, what the document is not.
9. **[Document-specific content sections.]**
10. **Falsifiable Predictions.** predictionbox environments with statement, empirical strategy, falsification condition, current status.
11. **Non-Assertion Declaration.** Numbered list of what the document does not claim.
12. **Limitations and Open Problems.** warningbox environments for limitations; prose for open research programme.
13. **Conclusion.** Contribution, epistemic status, next step.
14. **Future Work.** camafbox with itemise of declared directions.
15. **Methodological Note.** Unnumbered. Epistemic category, support level, conflict of interests, AI use.
16. **Author Contributions.** Unnumbered. CRediT-CAMAF taxonomy with six additional roles; ORCID; email.
17. **Conflict of Interests.** Unnumbered. Five categories with declared format (financial, institutional, personal relationships, intellectual investment, career incentives).
18. **Acknowledgments.** Unnumbered.
19. **Complete Version History.** Unnumbered. Longtable before references. Most recent on top. Format: version, hardcoded date, description of changes.
20. **References.** Numbered with natbib/plainnat.

Note on dates. The date on the title page uses \today or an equivalent full-month command, producing the compilation date. The date in the Version Changelog and Complete Version History is always manually set in the code: it represents the date of version production, not recompilation. This distinction allows local recompilations to be identified as distinct from the published artefact on Zenodo.

42 Complete Version History

Full audit record of all versions. Most recent on top. PATCH (+0.0.1) = form only. MINOR (+0.1.0) = new content without breaking claims. MAJOR (+1.0.0) = change that breaks citation compatibility.

Version	Date	Changes
v1.0.2	2026-05-31	PATCH: Clarity, spelling, and internal consistency revision. No claim altered.
v1.0.1	2026-05-26	PATCH: definitional vs. operational regime distinction. Claim 5 rewritten. Reconciliation Note added to Part IVB. CS1 expanded. Zero claims retracted.
v1.0.0	2026-05-26	First stable release. SemVer 2.0.0 adopted with public API declaration. Formatting migrated to template v1.4.1: 2.5cm margins, tcolorbox with accentblue scheme, titlesec. D5–D9 resolved (adapted CRediT, full COI protocol, functional pre-registration, FAIR by type, public communication). Compliance Declaration added with formalbox CS. Author Contributions, Conflict of Interests, and Retraction Conditions added. Version Changelog and Complete Version History in tabular format. Appendix B with v1.4 section architecture. Zero typographic overflows.
v0.7.0	2026-05	All pending decisions resolved: D5 adapted CRediT taxonomy; D6 full COI protocol; D7 functional pre-registration; D8 FAIR by type; D9 public communication.
v0.6.0	2026-05	Standard 10 corrected. Primary language defined by author's choice. Three language versions initiated.
v0.5.0	2026-05	CAMAF acronym corrected. Part IV rewritten with ten algorithmic prose examples. Part IVB added: CS1, CS2, CS3, CSx.
v0.4.0	2026-05	Empirical references added for all claims requiring them. Derivation chain DOIs and titles corrected. Standard 11 expanded.
v0.3.0	2026-05	Migration to Portuguese as primary development language. Section 1 rewritten with the 1989 observation. D3 resolved. IMRAD/CAMAF map added. Standard 14 expanded.
v0.2.0	2026-04	First complete draft in English. Fifteen standards, seven parts, ten pending decisions documented.
v0.1.0	2026-04	Structure approved. Full writing pending.

42 References

- Brand, A., Allen, L., Altman, M., Hlava, M., and Scott, J. (2015). Beyond authorship: Attribution, contribution, collaboration, and credit. *Learned Publishing*, 28(2), 151–155.
- Gabelica, M., Bojčić, R., and Puljak, L. (2022). Many researchers were not compliant with their published data sharing statement: a mixed-methods study. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 150, 33–41. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.05.019.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., and Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2-3), 61–83. DOI: 10.1017/S0140525X0999152X.
- Kerr, N. L. (1998). HARKing: Hypothesizing after the results are known. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2(3), 196–217. DOI: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0203_4.
- Moura, A. (2026a). CAMAF Framework: A Model-Agnostic Protocol for Epistemological Reliability in Human and AI-Generated Content. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19076532.
- Moura, A. (2026b). The Moura Fundamental Principle of Intelligence (FPI) and the CAMAF Axiomatic Framework: A Formal Epistemology for Information Integrity. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19325926.
- Moura, A. (2026c). The Moura Fundamental Principle of Intelligence (FPI): A Universal Mechanism for Recursive Construction and Decomposition of Patterns. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19424373.
- Moura, A. (2026d). Mourism: Epistemological Education and the Freedom to Decompose. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19435187.
- Moura, A. (2026e). The Moura Fundamental Principle of Intelligence (FPI) as a Paradigm Shift in the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19547021.
- Moura, A. (2026f). Structuristics: A Formal Field for the Study of Constructive and Decompositional Dynamics Across Domains, Substrates, and Scales. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19636897.
- Moura, A. (2026g). Galactic Rotation Curves as a Test Domain for Structuristics: Decompositional Integrity, Structural Regimes, and the Representation Limit of Baryonic Models. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19872381.
- Moura, A. (2026h). CAMAF Operational Standard Compliance Reference for All Derived Work. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19990064.
- Odrzywolek, A. (in press). All elementary functions from a single operator.
- Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251), aac4716. DOI: 10.1126/science.aac4716.
- Peters, D. P., and Ceci, S. J. (1982). Peer-review practices of psychological journals: The fate of published articles, submitted again. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 5(2), 187–195. DOI: 10.1017/S0140525X00011183.

- Solazzo, A. (2026). RENS: Recursive Epistemic Narrative Structures. [preprint].
- Sollaci, L. B., and Pereira, M. G. (2004). The introduction, methods, results, and discussion (IMRAD) structure: a fifty-year survey. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 92(3), 364–367.
- Tversky, A., and Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481), 453–458. DOI: 10.1126/science.7455683.
- Wazlawick, R. S. (2014). *Metodologia de Pesquisa para Ciência da Computação*. 6th printing. Elsevier.
- Zobel, J. (2014). *Writing for Computer Science*. 3rd edition. Springer.

42 Related Works

The documents below belong to the same research programme and are cited in the context of the derivation chain, but are not directly referenced in the claims of the main text.

- Moura, A. (2026). CAMAF Framework: A Model-Agnostic Protocol for Epistemological Reliability in Human and AI-Generated Content. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19076532.
- Moura, A. (2026). The Moura Fundamental Principle of Intelligence (FPI): A Universal Mechanism for Recursive Construction and Decomposition of Patterns. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19424373.
- Moura, A. (2026). Mourism: Epistemological Education and the Freedom to Decompose. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19435187.
- Moura, A. (2026). The Moura Fundamental Principle of Intelligence (FPI) as a Paradigm Shift in the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19547021.